



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/927,015

08/09/2001

Andrew R. Golding

10984-601001

4152

26161

7590

08/08/2006

FISH & RICHARDSON PC

P.O. BOX 1022

MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022

EXAMINER

LY, ANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2162

DATE MAILED: 08/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/927,015	Applicant(s) GOLDING, ANDREW R.	
	Examiner Anh Ly	Art Unit 2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-15, 18, 24 and 25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 16-17, 19-23 and 26-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is response to Applicant's AMENDMENT filed on 06/12/2006.
2. Clams 1-8, 16-17, 19-23 and 26-28 are pending in this Application.

Request for Continued Examination (RCE)

3. The request filed on 06/12/2006 for a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/927,015 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claims 1, 8, 16, 26, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. "general information", "specific information" and "machine readable media" (in claim 8) are not supporting in the application specification. What the "general information", the "specific information" and "one or more machine-readable media" are. It is unclear how one having ordinary in the skill in the art will understand the recited limitation. Applicant is advised to amend

Art Unit: 2162

the claims to provide a clear and concise language to the claims in order to one ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention as claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

6. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

7. Claims 1, 8, 16, 26, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are lacking of tangible result. Based on the new "guidelines" (dated 10/2005), the database here could be a table or a list of items on a paper without housing on a storage media. Also, claims 1, 8 and 28 are lacking "real world" result, that is, it is lacking of conveying/transforming the result to the user: no useful result. It is a no practical application. (see claims 16 and 27 as an example).

Claim Objections

8. Claims 1, 8, 16, 26, 27 and 28 are objected to because of the following informalities: Because "an element" and "a field" in line 6 of claim 1, line 7 of claim 8, line 7 of claim 16, line 8 of claim 26, line 10 of claim 10 and line 9 of claim 28 are not clear. They should point out and distinctly with the mentioned one in the claims.

Applicant is advised to amend the claims to provide a clear and concise language to the claims in order to one ordinary skill in the art to make and use the invention as claimed.

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1, 7, 8, 16, 17 and 26-28, as the best understanding of examiner, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,671,681 B1 issued to Emens et al. (hereinafter Emens) in view of Patent No.: US 6,587,858 B1 issued to Strazza, and further in view of Patent No.: US 6,026,396 issued to Hall.

With respect to claim 1, Emens teaches a computer-implemented method comprising:

obtaining a query for a database using one or more query generation rules, the database comprising elements, each element comprising fields, the elements comprising general information and the fields comprising specific information within the general information, the one or more query generation rules with an element of the database and a field in the element (fig. 1, item 40, a query string is received to search against a database or an information repository; and alternate queries, or query strings which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query: col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; also see figs. 1 & 2).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings (which is including textual descriptions containing words, phrases or sentence for finding the information in the searchable database) from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach annotating the query.

However, Strazza teaches the annotation tool for query-repose format (col. 12, lines 1-28 and see figs. 6 and 7).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Emens and Strazza. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of annotating the query for a database as disclosed (Strazza's col. 12, lines 1-28), into the system of Emens for the purpose of allowing for controlled and monitored access of data contained within the database/repository (Strazza's col. 1, lines 38-40), thereby, without requiring modification to such accesses or methods (Strazza's col. 2, lines 25-32). Emens and Strazza do not teach each generating a teaser that corresponding to the query, the teaser comprising a textual description.

However, Hall generating a teaser, a brief description of the query to be entered (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 28-67 and col. 10, lines 25-38).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, and further in view of Hall, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hall to the system of Emens to have a teaser for the corresponding query based on the element and the field of the database. The motivation being to establishing and querying a help list via threads and teasers, thereby, helping to obtain rapid responses to the inquiries (col. 1, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 35-50).

With respect to claims 2-3 and 5, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1. Also Emens teaches the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Strazza teach lookup table for storing queries. In combination, Emens and Strazza do not teach tearse for query.

However, Hall generating a teaser, a brief description of the query to be entered (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 28-67 and col. 10, lines 25-38).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, and further in view of Hall, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hall to the system of Emens to have a teaser for the corresponding query based on the element and the field of the database. The motivation being to establishing and querying a help list via threads and teasers, thereby, helping to obtain rapid responses to the inquiries (col. 1, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 35-50).

With respect to claim 4, Emens teaches wherein the one or more query generation rules are domain specific, the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

With respect to claims 6-7, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 1.

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Strazza teach lookup table for storing queries and annotating queries for the database. In combination, Emens and Strazza do not teach wherein if the input query matches the

stored query; and wherein the teaser is generated use one or more query matching rules.

However, Hall generating a teaser, a brief description of the query to be entered (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 28-67 and col. 10, lines 25-38); matching to a given queries and Internet and displaying the teaser (col. 2, lines 18-67 and col. col. 3, lines 1-45).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, and further in view of Hall, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hall to the system of Emens to have a teaser for the corresponding query based on the element and the field of the database. The motivation being to establishing and querying a help list via threads and tearsers, thereby, helping to obtain rapid responses to the inquiries (col. 1, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 35-50).

With respect to claim 7, Emens teaches wherein the target database resides on a server connected to the Internet (abstract, col. 2, lines 50-67).

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 16, Emens teaches generating, from a database, queries that correspond to the queries, the database comprising elements, the elements comprising fields, at least one of the queries comprising a selected element of the database and a selected field in the selected element; receiving an input query for the target database and identifying a stored query that corresponding to the input query

(fig. 1, item 40, a query string is received to search against a database or an information repository; and alternate queries, or query strings which are used to search against a database in the host computer system, are built due to being benefit from other experienced users (more efficient query search based on the knowledge of other experienced searches) and they are most likely more narrow than the initial search query: col. 6, lines 62-67 and col. 6, lines 1-28; also see figs. 1 & 2; fig. 1, box 10, where the search is received for retrieving the query string results as a summarizing of the best match found to the search request).

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository and a retrieval of alternate search query strings (which is including textual descriptions containing words, phrases or sentence for finding the information in the searchable database) from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach annotating the query.

However, Strazza teaches the annotation tool for query-repose format (col. 12, lines 1-28 and see figs. 6 and 7).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Emens and Strazza. One having ordinary skill in the art would have

Art Unit: 2162

found it motivated to utilize the use of annotating the query for a database as disclosed (Strazza's col. 12, lines 1-28), into the system of Emens for the purpose of allowing for controlled and monitored access of data contained within the database/repository (Strazza's col. 1, lines 38-40), thereby, without requiring modification to such accesses or methods (Strazza's col. 2, lines 25-32). Emens and Strazza do not teach each generating a teaser that corresponding to the query, the teaser comprising a textual description, outputting a stored teaser corresponding to the stored query that corresponding to the input query.

However, Hall generating a teaser, a brief description of the query to be entered (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 28-67 and col. 10, lines 25-38); matching to a given queries and Internet and displaying the teaser (col. 2, lines 18-67 and col. col. 3, lines 1-45).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, and further in view of Hall, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hall to the system of Emens to have a teaser for the corresponding query based on the element and the field of the database. The motivation being to establishing and querying a help list via threads and teasers, thereby, helping to obtain rapid responses to the inquiries (col. 1, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 35-50).

With respect to claim 17, Emens teaches the computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens teaches recording a prior search query and an associated prior query search result selected by a prior user during a prior search in a information repository

and a retrieval of alternate search query strings (which is including textual descriptions containing words, phrases or sentence for finding the information in the searchable database) from prior user, that is providing an alternate for a current query associated with a current search result during a current search of an information repository by a current user and the search results, which are generating from search engines are having the best match from the current search queries, which benefit and learn from the previous queries (fig. 1 and fig. 2). Emens does not clearly teach the queries are generated in accordance with one or more query-generation rules.

However, Strazza teaches the set of rules and matching rules (col. 1, lines 60-67 and col. 2, lines 1-18 and col. 5, lines 52-67).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined the teachings of Emens and Strazza. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of annotating the query for a database as disclosed (Strazza's col. 12, lines 1-28), into the system of Emens for the purpose of allowing for controlled and monitored access of data contained within the database/repository (Strazza's col. 1, lines 38-40), thereby, without requiring modification to such accesses or methods (Strazza's col. 2, lines 25-32). Emens and Strazza do not teach the tearses are generated in accordance with one or more query-matching rules.

However, Hall generating a teaser, a brief description of the query to be entered (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 28-67 and col. 10, lines 25-38); matching to a given queries and Internet and displaying the teaser (col. 2, lines 18-67 and col. col. 3, lines 1-45).

Therefore, based on Emens in view of Strazza, and further in view of Hall, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Hall to the system of Emens to have a teaser for the corresponding query based on the element and the field of the database. The motivation being to establishing and querying a help list via threads and tearsers, thereby, helping to obtain rapid responses to the inquiries (col. 1, lines 10-12 and col. 3, lines 35-50).

Claim 26 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to a computer program stored on a computer-readable medium rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 27 is essentially the same as claim 16 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 16 hereinabove.

Claim 28 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to an apparatus rather than a method (col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 1-54), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Art Unit: 2162

11. Claims 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent No.: US 6,671,681 B1 issued to Emens et al. (hereinafter Emens) in view of Patent No.: US 6,587,858 B1 issued to Strazza, and further in view of Patent No.: US 6,026,396 issued to Hall and Patent No.: US 6,732,088 B1 issued to Glance.

With respect to claim 19, Emens, in view of Strazza and Hall discloses a computer-implemented method as discussed in claim 16.

Emens, Strazza and Hall disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Emens, Strazza and Hall do not teach a tree-like data structure.

However, Glance teaches tree data structure (fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 5-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens, Strazza and Hall with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

With respect to claims 20-23, Emens teaches a method as discussed in claim 16. Also Emens teaches the domain corresponding to subject matter of the database (col. 2, lines 62-67 and col. 3, lines 1-22).

Emens, Strazza and Hall disclose substantially the invention as claimed.

Emens, Strazza and Hall do not teach a hash table, a cache, and displaying the stored teaser upon output.


However, Glance teaches generating a query database including all related queries information and displaying related queries to user for selection, database table for searching (figs. 3, 4 & 5; col. 6, lines 46-67 and col. 7, lines 1-22; fig. 9 and col. 9, lines 10-20).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Emens, Strazza and Hall with the teachings of Glance. One having ordinary skill in the art would have found it motivated to utilize the use of storing the query and the teaser in the database as disclosed (Glance's fig. 4 & 5), into the system of Emens for the purpose of maintaining the search query 's history information, thereby, improving the search process more efficient (Glance's col. 2, lines 20-30 and col. 7, lines 5-16).

Contact Information

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via E-Mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (**Written Authorization being given by Applicant (MPEP 502.03 [R-2])) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (Examiner's personal Fax No.)**). The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene, can be reached on (571) 272-4107 or **Primary Examiner: Jean Corrielus (571) 272-4032**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to: **Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300**

ANH LY 
JUL. 26th, 2006


JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER